

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN NORTH

People of the State of Michigan, If J. Nelson Atty.  
CHOCOLAY TWP./ UNCONSTITUTIONAL CORP.  
STATE OF MICHIGAN UNCONSTITUTIONAL CORP.  
RECOLONIZED BRITISH COLONY U.P. QUEENS HWY.  
FOREIGN LAW PRACTITIONER(S)  
OFFICER Id# 11 / CARRICK [Rep. For the Crown of England?] *[Signature]*  
BONDS and Indemnity Liability Ins. et al. For Chocolay Risk Man.  
All insurance john doe companies and policies purchased by Chocolay Twp.  
Malpractice insurance carriers for any Atty.  
who decides to attempt to prosecute this case  
Officer Carrick individually, and his wife if married  
or husband if he is sodomite. Plaintiffs et al.  
Attorney Co-Conspirator for Plaintiff  
Also under Sec 241-242 Judge who conspires is done.

FILED - MQ

March 22, 2024 3:52 PM

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
BY: slk / *[Signature]*

**2:24-cv-46**

Robert J. Jonker  
U.S. District Judge

/ Plaintiff

v.

john r. kanerva wronged man  
/ Defendant  
509 Dalton Rd.  
Skandia, Michigan 49885

From Case no. 240353ST  
Judge See R.O.A.  
Jury Demand yes.

**PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT pursuant to 28 U.S. CODE && 1331, 1441,(a) and 1446, defendant [john r. kanerva] hereby removes this action from [96<sup>th</sup> DISTRICT COURT MI] to [UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN NORTH].”**

**NOTICE OF REMOVAL / NOTICE OF FILING / PROOF OF SERVICE**

**NOTICE OF DISMISSAL “WITH PREJUDICE” FOR FALSE CRIMINAL CHARGE.**

**NOTICE OF DEFAULT FOR PLAINTIFFS FAILURE TO ANSWER DEFENDANT'S COUNTERCLAIM, individuals and CORPORATIONS.**

**DEFAULT IS ENTERED BY THE CLERK.  
ENTRY OF DEFAULT / “Ex Parte” Judgment.**

**Case Dismissed “With Prejudice against the Plaintiffs' et al”**

1. Introduction. Defendant is removing a case to the U.S. DISRICT COURT. The history of the Michigan 96<sup>th</sup> District Court and this case is such that, the clerk or court administrator, hid my and other timely filed answers, and didn't immediately file and enter them into the R.O.A., until I made inquiry about it.
2. R.O.A. = REGISTER OF ACTIONS. Someone VETTED THEM. They read my Appearance and Speedy


Trial by Jury Demand, 15 pgs. and exhibits. Omission of filing my answer was decided by someone to destroy or hide evidence. Clerk didn't say. But she may have been forced to do that or else she would be fired or abused by some supervisor, judge, director? This happens in other STATE cases. Other Counties.

3. That is a CRIME. Filing Rights are VIOLATED. This is a FOREIGN LAW, M.O. PRACTICE and different than U.S. procedure. Violation of Due Process of law / PREJUDICE against the Defendant. Why is this happening? Federal Questions plural. Plaintiffs complaint / claims are DISMISSED. I had to call and explain to the clerk, and warn her to place my answer into the file. Isn't it a crime to omit docs.?
4. That was long after after my Appearance, Plea, Speedy Trial by Jury Demand 15 page answer - Affidavit answer was taken into a back room office and the decision was made to not record the answer into the R.O.A. I investigated the missing Appearance, Answer Speedy Trial by Jury. It's missing from 1<sup>st</sup> R.O.A.
5. The Demand, AFFIDAVIT, The case was DISMISSED without prejudice. That's contrary to law. It's "With Prejudice" The Dismissal is MISREPRESENTED. The form the D.A. or Clerk, or Judge is using is ERRANT. It is created drafted intentionally WRONG.
6. The court rule states that in a case like this, false misdemeanor, 28 days are allocated for the Speedy Trial by Jury. After that Case is dismissed "WITH PREJUDICE". They checked box WITHOUT PREJUDICE. There is no other box option to check. I included this TRUTH.
7. See MY ANSWER WITH MCR 6.004. The STATES Form is in error/wrong. The form will not announce that the court rule was violated by the plaintiff/STATE/D.A./or JUDGE. The case is DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE as the The Speedy Trial by Jury Demand was violated.
8. My Jury Trial Right, denial of Jury and representation of dismissal is falsified by the plaintiff/STATE, and that the STATE ACTORS ARE IN FACT Operating by fraudulent prejudice process to harm defendants who use this countries law, when they use FOREIGN law. PEONAGE rules not this country.
9. It is designed to make all defendants lose their cases by being victims of denovo retrying expired cases, if they don't understand the dismissal process for unconstitutional state statutes, time to prosecute a case, and that the plaintiff/court will intentionally violate ones rights.
10. They recharge some one because that party is not aware that they won already. Defendant won defeated the charges with prejudice against the plaintiff / STATE ACTORS. This does not please the plaintiffs' who believe they must win all cases. They believe Defendants may not win their cases. They're PEONS.
11. Defendants get placed into DOUBLE JEOPARDY. They don't know it. Then the court/judge and D.A. continue to pretend that the cases are legally charged when in fact they are expired by time in favor of the defendant. Michigan's court system is designed for all defendants to lose. Innocent or not.
12. Without prejudice leaves the option to falsely recharge a defendant putting him in double jeopardy, continually harming defendants who won already, because the plaintiff/court did not give them their speedy trial by jury in the time required by law.
13. Defendants are "**Entitled to Dismissal [with prejudice]**". Filing with my first 4 marked clerk entered exhibits A, B1, B2, C. A decision was made to not file my answer into the record. I witnessed this when I filed my answer and exhibits on January 31<sup>st</sup> 2024.
14. The case is DISMISSED. The Dismissal is MISREPRESENTED. The form the D.A. or Clerk, or Judge is using is ERRANT. It is intentionally WRONG. The court rule states that in a case like this, false misdemeanor, 28 days are allocated for the Speedy Trial by Jury.

15. After that Case dismissed WITH PREJUDICE. They checked box WITHOUT PREJUDICE. There is no other box option to check. I had to negotiate a warning for the clerk to cover her own "backside" so she doesn't get in trouble for who ever told her to hide my answer filed 1/31/2024. I called it
16. Appearance and Speedy Trial by Jury Demand. I was falsely charged with a crime which didn't exist. The "Director of Court Operations" or a judge might have told her to hide it. Maybe the D.A. told her to not file my answer. Attached the 1<sup>st</sup> and second pg. 1 of the R.O.A.
17. The case is now DISMISSED. The Dismissal is MISREPRESENTED. The form the D.A. or Clerk, or Judge is using is ERRANT. It is intentionally WRONG. The court rule states that in a case like this, false misdemeanor, 28 days are allocated for the Speedy Trial by Jury.
18. After that Case dismissed WITH PREJUDICE. They checked box WITHOUT PREJUDICE. There is no other box option to check, stating that the case would be dismissed with prejudice. There is also tampering with evidence, by police officer and or CHOCOLAY TWP.
19. See filed email. Audio / Video IT computer evidence employee tampered with / EDITED, part of the traffic stop event I specifically told them to include, wherein the officer told the passenger, he saw him at Lakenenland on a side by side. He said, come in person before bond.
20. That way they could arrest me and harm me further. Not any longer. I won the case. They claimed P.R. BOND when the plaintiff was required to post BOND. I'm on MEDICAID. This is where the POSTED U.S. CODE NOTICES were in the FACE of OFFICER CARRICK.
21. I also saw him there on snowmobile, and the NOTICE was by the trail where he / snowmobile cop Carrick was on a snowmobile parked next to the NOTICES that United States law / CODES Rule, not repugnant PEON PEONAGE European laws, strip you of rights and cash.
22. Public and judicial notice of Fraud on the Court (state). Removing cases to the Federal Court is a requirement when STATE courts insist on falsifying courts records and OMIT defendants filings / answers, counter complaints / claims. because said defendant exposed FOREIGN LAW Practices - Complaint errors. Contrary to U.S. Codes / Constitution. Subsequently omitting filing my served answer
23. Officer Carrick Chocolay Twp. was NOTICED / that U.S. CODE TITLE 18 United States of America laws protected the defendant from FOREIGN claims that Traveling isn't not a right, but only an annual purchased color code privilege, ignoring the U.S.CODES, posted at Lakenenland, Chocolay TWP. LEASE FOR YOUR BODY \$ yrs. or so.
24. U.S. CODES were designed to protect the defendant. He Officer Carrick, cited the defendant. The citation is labeled an ARREST. ARRESTABLE OFFENSE. Only in a FOREIGN COUNTRY. Defendant cited Federal U.S. CODES which caused the Officer to think twice. Then the cover-up began by plaintiff.
25. The defendant was detained by temporary arrest. Not brought to jail but charged with a false crime. He acknowledged this in the police report, but made the mistake to cite me anyway. He pretended that the Right of Way, was a Foreign Way, and that some PERMIT, LICENSE purchase agreement was required.
26. The MI Police - Secretary of State forced almost everyone ignorant of this countries laws to contract with their FOREIGN CORPORATION. This is very lucrative for one of the the **FOREIGN CORPORATIONS' Secretary of State. MI.** She failed to respond, as did the STATE and Chocolay. Twp. They agreed by silence. Stolen money taken by subterfuge and threat of force, to the uneducated.

27. Once the plaintiff was NOTIFIED that they claimed BRITISH LAW QUEENS HWY. And Cited me after they were given U.S. CODES Verbally, they decided to lie and PRETEND THE DEFENDFANT is FROM the **FEDERAL DISTRITO OF MEXICO**. See police report and Exhibits.
28. They also listed my 107 TAMARACK, ST. GWINN, MI 49841 HOME ADDRESS, as FEDERAL DISTRITO OF MEXICO. My land is is protected under U.S. Land Patent. Claims by FOREIGN GOVERNMENT AGENCIES, that it is British or Mexican are errant. Or in the alternative CHOCOLAY TOWNSHIP CLAIMS THAT part of MI to be MEXICO as well.
29. WHY DOES THE THE CHOCOLAY TOWNSHIP POLICE DEPARTMENT DECLARE THAT THE Defendant, now the VICTOR in the CASE SUCESSFULLY DEFENDING THE CASE, IS FROM OR the U.P. Is INSIDE THE FEDERAL DISTRITO OF MEXICO??? When he is really from the Upper Peninsula, MI
30. Couple Marquette County Red necks expose a treasonous effort by MI and Sec of State law enforcement to end the United States as we know or knew it. This case is an Ex parte Judgment against the plaintiff. There is no evidence to the contrary. The plaintiff simply refused to file a responsive pleading. What else could they say but I'm sorry. Forgive us. We didn't know. It was an error. This is United States, not MEXICO. 1<sup>st</sup> we thought this was England, but we switched jurisdiction to MEXICO.
31. Now we see that there is TREASON by the plaintiff in Marquette County MICHIGAN. This should alarm any Judge, Magistrate, Clerk of Court, and an immediate acknowledgment of Dismissal with prejudice must be acknowledged and Entry of Default against lying plaintiffs et al signed as Judgment of default. The Clerk is witness.

Thank you, respectfully,

  
john r. kanerva wronged man  
UCC 1-308 UNDER RESERVE